UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/581,499	06/02/2006	Kai Schiemann	MERCK-3188	3818
23599 7590 08/28/2008 MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C. 2200 CLARENDON BLVD.			EXAMINER	
			BALASUBRAMANIAN, VENKATARAMAN	
SUITE 1400 ARLINGTON, VA 22201			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1624	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/28/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/581,499	SCHIEMANN ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	/Venkataraman Balasubramanian/	1624				
The MAILING DATE of this communication apperiod for Reply	opears on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING [- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tird d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from te, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02</u> .	<u>June 2006</u> .					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ Th	is action is non-final.					
,	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-57 is/are pending in the applicatio 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) 1-57 are subject to restriction and/or	awn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examir						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicati ority documents have been receive au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary	v (PTO-413)				
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						

DETAILED ACTION

The preliminary amendment filed on 6/2/2006 is made of record. Claims 1-57 are pending.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claims 1-54, drawn to compound of formula I wherein X is N, namely triazolo or pyrazolotriazine, composition and method of use.

Group II, claims 1-54, drawn to drawn to compound of formula I wherein X is C, namely triazolo or pyrazolopyrimidine, composition and method of use.

Group III, claims 55-57, drawn to intermediate compound of formula I-1, namely triazolo or pyrazolodiamines.

The inventions listed as Groups I, II and III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

Where there is lack of unity the requirement for restriction is proper- See MPEP 803.02. The requirement for unity of invention is two-fold: (1) common utility and (2) sharing a substantial structural feature disclosed as being essential to the utility. Both these conditions are to be met with. Instant claims do not meet both these conditions.

Invention I, II and III are independent and distinct from each other because they are directed to structurally dissimilar compounds that lack common core, namely, various heterocyclic groups such as pyrazolotriazine and triazolotriazine versus pyrazolopyrimidine and triazolopyrimidine versus diaminotriazole and diaminopyrazole cores. Consequently, the groups require separate prior art searches. They can be made and used independently. Art which may render obvious or anticipate one of the groups would not necessarily do the same for the other group. For example prior art cited in the International Search Report and the Information Disclosure Statement may not be applicable to all the above groups. Each can support a patent as the compounds of each group are capable of being utilized alone not in combination with other members listed in the Markush group.

Except for the N-C=N-N-C-N group, every ring and substituents in the core of compound of formula I is varied and it cannot be said that a ring bearing such a group essentially contribute to the utility recited in the claims. Thus, the common structural feature essential for the said utility is not met with. Furthermore, Group III relates to intermediate compound which cannot be said to share the same use as the final products of Group I and Group II.

In addition, common utility requirement is also not met with as evident from the claims that these compounds can be used for variety of diseases including neurodegenerative diseases, neuronal disorders including epilepsy, Alzheimer's disease, Parkinson's disease, retinal diseases, spinal cord injury, head trauma, mood disorders, particularly bipolar mood disorders, multiple sclerosis or amyotrophic lateral

Page 4

sclerosis, diabetes, particularly type 11 diabetes and obesity, asthma, septic shock, transplant rejection, cerebrovascular accident, glaucoma, cardiovascular diseases including stroke, arteriosclerosis, myocardial infarction, myocardial reperfusion injury, ischemic disorders, cancer and inflammatory diseases including arteriosclerosis, arthritis, inflammatory bowel disease and rheumatoid arthritis. In addition, prior art cited in the Information Disclosure Statement and International search report clearly state other uses for the instant compounds. Thus, both the criteria set forth for unity of invention is not met with.

In view of distinct nature of each invention, the restriction requirement is set forth in writing.

Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different structural make-up;
- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);

(d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;

(e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable

over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be addressed to Venkataraman Balasubramanian (Bala) whose telephone number is (571) 272-0662. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8.00 AM to 6.00 PM. The Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) of the art unit 1624 is James O. Wilson, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned (571) 273-8300. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAG. Status

Application/Control Number: 10/581,499 Page 7

Art Unit: 1624

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-2 17-9197 (toll-free).

/Venkataraman Balasubramanian/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1624